Church Union News and Views

Organ of the Continuation Committee

of the

South India Joint Committee on Union

Vol. I SEPTEMBER 1930 No. 2

CONTENTS

		Page
1.	**EDITORIAL**	
	THE NEXT STEP	51
	SECTION VIII, (C), (7)	52
	THE WESLEYAN METHODIST CONFERENCE AND THE PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION	54
	CAN WE UNDERSTAND ONE ANOTHER?	56
	THE CHRISTIAN UNITY LEAGUE	57
	WHAT DOES 'COMPREHENSION' MEAN?	58
2.	**ARTICLES**	
	SOME THOUGHTS ON THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE	59
	THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE AND THE PROPOSALS FOR UNION IN SOUTH INDIA	62
	LAMBETH AND SOUTH INDIA	67
	BOURNEMOUTH CONFERENCE OF THE WORLD CONGREGATIONAL UNION—JULY 1930	70
	ARE WE MOVING TOWARDS AN *IMPASSE*	73
	THE PASSION FOR UNION	75
	WHAT IS THE ALTERNATIVE?	78
	TELUGU CHURCH COUNCIL	80
3.	**BOOK REVIEWS**	82
4.	**CLIPPINGS**	88

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras

1930

The Christian Literature Society for India

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras

Books on Church Union in South India

	Price Rs	A
IN ENGLISH		
THE PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION		
Prepared by the Joint Committee on Union ..	0	4
CHURCH UNION—An Indian View.		
By Dr. A. J. Appasamy	0	4
CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA—The Story of the Negotiation.		
By the Bishop of Madras—S. P. C. K.	1	8
THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM—A survey of the present position.		
Edited by Sir James Marchant, K.B.E, LL.D.—CASSELL.	5	0
LAUSANNE, LAMBETH AND SOUTH INDIA—Notes on the present position of the Reunion Movement.		
By N. P. Williams, D.D.—S. P. C. K.	1	14
IN TAMIL		
SCHEME OF UNION EXPLAINED—Published under the authority of the Joint Committee on Union ..	0	4
IN TELUGU		
SCHEME OF UNION EXPLAINED—Published under the authority of the Joint Committee on Union ..	0	4

SPECIAL INTERCESSION
AND
PRAYERS FOR UNITY

Issued by the Continuation Committee

Available in English and in Tamil

Price, Rs 2-8-0 per 100

CHURCH UNION

News and Views

Editorial Board

THE LORD BISHOP OF MADRAS — REV. J. S. M. HOOPER, M.A.
K. T. PAUL, ESQ., B.A., O.B.E. — REV. J. J. BANNINGA, D.D.
(*Managing Editor.*)

Publishers

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

Vol. I **SEPTEMBER 1930** **No. 2**

Editorial

The Next Step

A great many friends will ask what will happen now that various Synods, Assemblies and Conferences have spoken with reference to the South India Scheme for Church Union. The answer is that there will, probably, be a meeting of the Joint Committee on Union before the end of 1930. At this meeting the members of that committee will have to consider very carefully the recommendations of the General Assembly of the South India United Church, the Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Church, and the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, together with the resolutions of the World Congregational Council at Bournemouth, the Wesleyan Conference in England and the Lambeth Conference.

When the Joint Committee has drafted its 'Revised Scheme for Union' this will have to be submitted to the bodies in India for their consideration. In the case of the United Church these recommendations will probably go directly to the various Church Councils and be considered by them in the light of the Assembly resolutions and their own convictions regarding union. Similarly in the case of the Wesleyan Synod these resolutions will go to their various districts and their Provincial Synod. In the case of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon the revised scheme will no doubt go to the General Council and Episcopal Synod.

In the case of the S.I.U.C. any recommendations that the Church Councils make will have to go to the General Assembly which will meet in October, 1931. Whether a final decision can be reached there or not remains to be seen. The General Assembly may refer back some things in the Scheme to the Councils or may want to refer the Scheme itself to official bodies such as the Mission Boards and Councils in England, Scotland and America. In the case of the Wesleyans anything that is done by the Provincial Synod will have to go home to the Conference in England and there may have to be correspondence back and forth for two or three years. In the case of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon inasmuch as we now have the resolutions of the Lambeth Conference we can say that their General Council and Episcopal Synod can go ahead and decide the issues involved. But in any case friends or foes of the 'Proposed Scheme may' depend upon it that at every step careful, prayerful thought will be given to the whole matter and that nothing will be done without the fullest consultation of all concerned. All Christian people everywhere are called upon to continue in prayer that those concerned may know God's will clearly and have the courage to do it.

Section VIII, (C), (7)

Many a true democrat sees in this Section grave danger that any Church built upon this resolution in the 'Proposed Scheme' must necessarily become a Church in which prelacy and sacerdotalism will have an unlimited sway. The section reads as follows:

Propositions on Faith and Doctrine, etc.

'When any proposition (in which term are included proposed enactments, statements and resolutions, and also forms of public worship) is brought before the Synod which directly concerns

(*a*) the faith and doctrine of the Church,
(*b*) the conditions of membership in the Church,
(c) the functions of the ordained ministers of the Church,
or (*d*) the worship of the Church, and any forms of worship proposed for general use in the Church,

the matter shall be discussed in the Synod in the usual manner, but the proposition shall be submitted to the Synod for final voting thereon only in a form approved by the bishops sitting separately for that purpose.

'The proposition when thus placed before the Synod may be discussed, and, if desired, be referred back to the bishops for further consideration and possible modification.

'Such a proposition shall be declared to have been passed only if it obtains a two-thirds majority (or three-quarters, in the case referred to in chapter XIII A. of this Constitution) of the number of members of the Synod present and voting.

'At any stage of its discussion, such a proposition may be referred by the Synod to the Diocesan Councils for their opinion.

'If the bishops refuse to place such a proposition before the Synod for a final vote in any form whatever, or if the proposition fail to receive the support of the necessary majority, the matter shall be dropped for that meeting of the Synod, but may be brought forward again with due notice after an interval to be fixed by regulation of the Synod.'

It may be frankly admitted that this section of the 'Proposed Scheme' has not received the careful thought and attention of the whole Joint Committee that most of the other sections received. However the very centre of the section is intended to conserve the thought of the Church after union so that there shall be no hasty or unworthy steps taken to change the fundamental beliefs and practices of the Church at the time of union. It is undoubtedly true that to one who has not been accustomed to episcopacy this seems to place in the hands of the bishops a power altogether unwarranted, for without their consent no resolution dealing with these four very important and fundamental aspects of Church life can be modified. But when it is realised that alongside of the bishops there are Provincial Councils and a Synod with which the bishops must continue in friendly relations and in fellowship with whom they must do practically all their work it will be seen that no bishop or group of bishops that attempt to rule over the united Church will be able to get very far in their attempt. The history of the British monarchy alongside of a growing parliament will give us a vision of a truly constitutional episcopacy in the future. English history clearly shows us, as Mr. Witney has pointed out in an article in the United Church Herald, that no monarch, the establishment of a parliament having been granted, could long control that parliament or even apart from parliament continue long to carry out his own wish as opposed to parliament. In the very necessity of things parliament had to win out. In spite of the recurrence of dictatorships in the world today, it will, in the course of a short time, again be proved that such individual rule cannot last long. For the world today is essentially democratic and the people who hold the power will not in the long run permit that power to be overrun.

Hence even though men of the worst type of individuality and domineering proclivities should get into the Bishop's office it is quite inconceivable that such men would be long able to rule a Church in which there were Diocesan Councils and Synods with men perhaps equally strong but united together against any form of dictatorship.

However it is not necessary to anticipate such dangers. Modern intercommunication and the modern fellowship even among the nations of the world as well as among the peoples within any one nation will make any form of prelacy practically impossible. Hence even if this section of the 'Proposed Scheme' should stand no great harm need come to the Church. There is, however, the possibility of modification and one thing seems certain in the minds of all, that the united Church shall leave no room for any kind of prelacy or dictatorship. All that is desired is that in the united Church there should be a real scope for genuine spiritual leadership, and that we all want.

The Wesleyan Methodist Conference and the Proposed Scheme of Union

The Wesleyan Methodist Conference met at Leeds, in July, and in the Representative Session there was considerable discussion of the South Indian Union Scheme. The following resolutions were adopted after the discussion, and the same resolutions were adopted without discussion in the Pastoral Session of the Conference in the following week.

'1. The Conference has received with profound thankfulness the "Proposed Scheme of Union prepared by the Joint Committee of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the South India United Church, and the South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church for presentation to the governing bodies of these Churches in India and elsewhere". The Conference believes that organic union is in the interests of the Kingdom of God in India, and rejoices at the spirit of union which the Scheme manifests. It renders thanks to the great Head of the Church, Who by His Spirit has guided the representatives of these Churches to so large a measure of agreement in questions of so great importance to the Church of Christ in South India and to the spread of His Kingdom there.

2. The Conference authorises the South India Provincial Synod to continue the consultations with the representatives of the other Churches concerned, and will watch with the most sympathetic interest the further progress of such consultations.

3. The Conference instructs the Joint Committee of the Missionary Committee and the Committee on Faith and Order to continue their consideration of the whole scheme, and also to receive and consider any recommendations or information which may be received from the South India Provincial Synod or other sources, and to present a report to the next Conference.'

Reports received from England agree on the admirable tone that marked the whole course of the discussion; no voice was raised in opposition to the Scheme, though it was felt that fuller consideration must be given to such points as those named in the Resolutions of the South India Provincial Synod. In the further consultations that will take place in India there is the assurance that the most sympathetic interest will be taken by Conference in all that is done. At this stage final and unqualified approval of the Scheme is not and cannot be given; but more than one speaker made it plain that the judgment of the Church in India is not likely to be overruled or hampered by the Church in England. Dr. Scott Lidgett, for instance, in a weighty speech, said: 'He hoped that both Lambeth and the Wesleyan Conference would be wise enough to realise that views could not be dictated by the West to be accepted by the East. They must avoid giving the impression that they were the tools of any movement for Western ascendancy, and make it plain that they were looking for the growing up of a great branch of the Christian Church in India which should be under Eastern control.' Dr. W. R. Maltby urged that in all documents on the subject of union they should endeavour to convey to the average man, the man-in-the-street, the fact that they really did believe this to be a very great question and that their whole heart was in it. He also pleaded for the frankest statement of points of difference, as on matters on which they had not yet been brought to union, and on which they desired further light from God. And the President Designate, Dr. Ryder Smith, urging the most careful study of the scheme and of all its implications, began his speech by saying that it was easily the most important thing before Conference this year. There is thus every guarantee that as far as the Wesleyan Methodist Church is concerned a most kindly and sympathetic atmosphere has been created for the further consultations that will be taking place within the coming months.

Can we understand one another?

A Conference was recently held at King's College, London, at which members of the Church of England, representative of various schools of thought within its membership, came together and discussed the Anglican attitude toward the Holy Communion. An article by the Rev. T. Dilworth-Harrison in the *Church Times* for August 1, gives an interesting report of this Conference. Other reports have appeared in the *Guardian* and other papers. The purpose of the meeting was a desire to discover whether or not some united, definite expression could be given to that faith in the 'Holy Mysteries' which must animate all who love the Lord Christ in sincerity and who accept the discipline of the English Church.

It is very interesting to note that the people who came together most of whom were Anglo-Catholics, did find a certain amount of agreement in their views. The one very special result of the Conference seems to have been the repudiation on the part of the Anglo-Catholics that they were Mediaevalists and believed in any *magic* connected with the Eucharist. Mr. Dilworth-Harrison quotes from the Council of Trent and also from Cardinal Newman to show that the Real Presence in which the Catholic believes is a spiritual Presence and that each communicant must receive that Presence through faith. He quotes with approval from an article by the Bishop of Hereford in the *Guardian* in which the latter says 'On the one hand it must be maintained that in the Sacrament there is a Real Presence and a real gift not constituted by the faith of the receiver and on the other hand only by faith can that gift be taken or that Presence perceived.'

If High Church Anglo-Catholics and Low Church Evangelicals can come together on some such understanding of terms and theories there is still hope that the Holy Spirit may lead men into the full truth. There is no doubt that those who hold the Evangelical theory of the Lord's Supper and those who hold the High Church theories should come together in much closer fellowship. They undoubtedly will learn very much from each other of the greatest value if they could come into that real fellowship that is found only at the Lord's Table. No man who is exclusive in his fellowship at the Lord's Table can really understand the fullest and best that God has to give to him through that great gift. In lowly, humble fellowship with his brethren at the Lord's Table he can penetrate more fully into God's secrets than anywhere else.

The Christian Unity League

Under the leadership of Dr. Peter Ainslie a Movement has been started in America with the name given above. The members of this League have adopted a Unity Pact which reads as follows:

> 'We, Christians of various churches, believing that only in a co-operative and united Christendom can the world be Christianized, deplore a divided Christendom as being opposed to the Spirit of Christ and the needs of the world. We, therefore, desire to express our sympathetic interest in and prayerful attitude toward all conferences, small and large, that are looking toward reconciliation of the divided Church of Christ.
>
> 'We acknowledge the equality of all Christians before God and propose to follow this principle, as far as possible, in all our spiritual fellowships. We will strive to bring the laws and practices of our several communions into conformity with this principle, so that no Christian shall be denied membership in any of our churches, nor the privilege of participation in the observance of the Lord's Supper, and that no Christian minister shall be denied the freedom of our pulpits by reason of differences in forms of ordination.
>
> 'Irrespective of denominational barriers, we pledge to be brethren one to another in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord and Saviour, whose we are and whom we serve.'

This Christian Unity League has already held various conferences in different cities in America and a large number of names of very prominent men of various denominations have already been signed to its Pact. As will be seen from this document the League is really a movement centering round the Lord's Table. All members of the League pledge themselves to recognize the equality of all Christians before God and they propose to follow this principle in their spiritual fellowships. Hence they make the Lord's Supper a gathering place where they may meet together with their Lord and find in Him the centre of their whole life. This movement, while in a sense cutting across the movement for Church Union, is calling the attention of men to the great truth that union in Christ consists not so much in organizations or constitutions or theories or ceremonies as it does in a sincere following of Christ and a fellowship with all who are thus sincerely following the Master. While many cannot accept all the implications of this Unity League no one can deny the valuable contribution it is making to the cause of Union by turning the eyes of men from the History of the Christian Church to direct spiritual reali-

ties. While there is undoubtedly great emphasis to be laid upon the historical continuity of the Church, its Ministry, Sacraments and Creeds, the members of the League insist that direct fellowship with Christ today is more important than any amount of historical accuracy with reference to the past. Hence they begin their movement with such spiritual realities and on the basis thereof try to build up a fellowship in Christ.

What does 'Comprehension' mean?

A great deal has been said with reference to the thought that any united Church of the future must be a 'comprehensive Church'. It is inconceivable that any of the present denominations can come to such uniformity in thought and practice that they can become a united Church on the basis of a thorough agreement on all points that might arise. Hence there must be in such a Church a possibility for men to hold varying views even on important matters of doctrine and practice.

At first glance this seems impossible. 'How can ', one may ask, 'two men, one of whom is a strong Evangelical and the other a strong Catholic, unite in one Church'? The answer is simple. Each must recognise the other as a sincere loyal follower of Jesus Christ. For either to say, 'I know the truth better than you do, I am more honest in my convictions. I am more pious in my relation to God. I am more sincere in my actions', is sheer hypocrisy. We must come to the attitude of Jesus whose great challenge to men was 'Follow thou Me' and the great Church of the future must be based upon that one thought,—that any man who is an honest, conscientious follower of Jesus Christ must find in that Church a true spiritual home. That Church can have no room for any bitterness or any superiority-complex, or for what is even much worse,—spiritual pride. Hence a 'comprehensive' Church is a Church in which every man tries his best to follow Jesus Christ as closely as he possibly can and welcomes into a real brotherhood every other man who likewise claims that he is honestly trying to follow Jesus Christ. Any differences of opinion between them will be lost completely in their common loyalty to a common Lord.

Articles

Some thoughts on the Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference

After the heated controversy which had been aroused by the South Indian proposals, we naturally arrived in some anxiety, tempered though it was by the experience of ten years that the union of Christ's people is so plainly declared by Him to be His purpose, that those who honestly try to find the right way and to follow the guidance of His Spirit never in the end separate in hopeless disagreement. So it proved at Lambeth. The resolutions of the large Committee which prepared them for the Conference and again of the Conference when it received them were unanimous.

Of course, it might have been possible to get a majority vote on more detailed proposals which might have been desired by all or many of those who were definitely concerned in the negotiations: but that would have been simply to divide the Conference and the Anglican Church in India as well as in England into parties and to throw stumbling blocks in the way of union. And so we are profoundly thankful for the unanimity with which the report was received.

The Synod of the Anglican Church in India had asked for definite advice on certain points. The answers were given by the Committee and generally approved by the whole Conference. We will take the minor and specific points first.

1. Is Consecration to the Episcopate without previous Episcopal ordination, at least to the Presbyterate, allowable? The answer is: 'Yes: there are precedents and it is valid and in the special circumstances justifiable'.

2. Is Confirmation by a Bishop so necessary before consecration that it would throw doubt on the consecration if it were omitted? (This view had been put forward strongly in England). 'No: it has not been so universally demanded that it must be now laid down as a condition of union'.

3. May Presbyters take part in the laying on of hands at the consecration of Bishops? At the inaugural consecration it is an appropriate act: as a general custom it is not advised, though it would not invalidate a consecration by Bishops in the usual way: and it is the practice of the Swedish Church, where Presbyters do lay hands with the bishops at the consecration of a bishop, in token of their acceptance of the newly consecrated bishop as their chief pastor.

Turning now to more general points. The question of Intercommunion is fundamental to the Union. No Church would enter a union which cut it off from the churches with which it is in communion at present. That means that the United Church will be in communion both with episcopal and non-episcopal churches, as indeed the Church of Sweden is. The Conference accepted the position, only remarking that the ordinary rules of the churches outside would naturally continue to be applied in the case of individuals.

The negotiating committees in India have never claimed that the Union would give fresh rights in other churches to individuals who had not enjoyed them before. The rules of episcopal ordination or of confirmation in the Anglican Churches would continue to apply unless they themselves modified them. After all neither the joint committee nor the Lambeth Conference can give orders to any Anglican Province as to what it shall or shall not do. The Conference did remind its members of the fact that there is no canonical authority to refuse Communion to any baptized person kneeling at the Lord's Table unless he be excommunicate by name or in a canonical sense of the term a cause of scandal to the faithful. It is impossible to think, especially considering the cordial encouragement given by bishops of all countries and all schools of thought to the South India proposals, that rigid rules would be applied to visiting members who asked for the hospitality of the church in whose area they found themselves. Indeed this is the usual custom now in such cases. The cases where rules might be applied fall under two heads. Communicants who went to live permanently in the area of an episcopal church and desired to be enrolled definitely in their communicant membership might naturally be asked to comply with the confirmation rule of the church in which they wish to be enrolled as members, and ministers ordained in the United Church might naturally be asked not to celebrate the communion in competing or separately organized churches in the same area. For the real cause of division and its real sin is the definite intention to organize separate churches and separate ministries in the same area. If there is the will and purpose to unite, much interchange of ministries is possible which would not otherwise help union. The definite intention to remain separate makes even the shared Communion unreal, and so the Conference declared full intercommunion to be the final goal of negotiations.

The Committee endorsed the general plan proposed in the last joint meeting of not trying to make rules to preserve the traditions of the uniting churches, but of giving a mutual pledge and trusting one another. At the same time it desired to be clear what the content of the pledge was. We of the joint Committee knew but several members remarked to me: 'It is all very well for you; for you have

been at the meetings: we outside do not know exactly to what you are referring'. When it was explained, they were satisfied but they wanted the explanation set out for future generations. If, as they hope the South India plan becomes a pattern for other unions, this seems only reasonable.

While we are discussing the question of intercommunion a resolution which arose from circumstances in other parts of the world and not in connexion with India may be mentioned. Where people are cut off from their own church entirely, a limited acquiescence was given to their attendance at other communions, where they were available. There were naturally many members of the conference, who held strict views about the ministry and the Apostolical succession. We ought to state at once that though these views were recognized as being held by many, they did not dominate the conference. The obvious fact that has already been recognized in our own negotiations, as in others, is that there cannot be a united Church with ministers deriving their commission from different sources. The unification of the ministry is an absolute necessity: and the acceptance of the historic episcopate as the means for that unification has been widely conceded. It became necessary to define the meaning of the historic episcopate, as it is often misunderstood and has been held to include very different views which are not shared even by all the members of the Anglican Churches. It has been asked on the one hand how we can say that ministries which do not depend on the episcopate are in their spheres real ministries of the Word and Sacraments and yet in practice insist on the necessity of an episcopal ministry. On the other hand it is asked how one can accept as a sufficient basis of union the historic episcopate without requiring any theory of it as a condition of unity. The Committee replied that by the historic Episcopate we mean that episcopate which emerged early in the history of the church and has continued till to-day. The Committee refused to discuss vexed questions concerning its origin. There it is, doing the work which it has done from the earliest times. It has passed through various phases; its origin was gradual but finally it assumed a universal type: it was invaded by the world, and the 'feudal Prelates' and 'the spiritual Peers' were not truly representative of it; it has been obscured by the Papal supremacy, and was therefore abandoned by many of the Protestant churches. But beyond and before all these perversions, it has stood and still stands in its essential form with its succession in office and its succession in consecration. Its duties are general superintendence of the church and clergy: maintenance of unity in the one Eucharist: ordination: safeguarding the faith and administration of the discipline of the church. Whatever perversions there may have been, these things were always there. And so we ask for its continuance with its

functions. The Committee further agree that it must be constitutional in the exercise of its duties and that Anglicans might learn much in this respect from non-episcopal churches. It follows then that the acceptance of the proviso in the South India scheme that no theory should be demanded but that the functions should be described (as in fact they are) was unanimously conceded.

As far as the Anglican Church is concerned, we are greatly encouraged not only or chiefly by the resolutions but by the warm sympathy and earnest desire for the accomplishment of our union in South India and by the frank and bold recognition of the special problems and the readiness to accept the solutions proposed. It is true that the determination of the S.I.U. and Wesleyan Methodist churches that the resulting church should be autonomous and not Anglican in the technical sense helped to relieve the consciences of those who were willing to be in communion with a church but were not so ready to pass over anomalies in an Anglican Province, but there was a real expression of good will: a real promise of fellowship and communion: and a real looking forward to the emergence of a part of the Universal Church with which there would be the closest connexion in the not distant future, and for all that loving sympathy we thank God.

HARRY MADRAS.

The Lambeth Conference and the Proposals for Union in South India

By the Bishop of Tinnevelly

It is desirable to begin by describing the procedure which the Lambeth Conference follows, since this affects the form in which the results of its deliberations are published. In the first week of the Conference, the different subjects under consideration are introduced by chosen speakers, and a short general debate on each subject follows. Then each subject is remitted to a Committee, which again often divides itself into sub-committees to work out different parts of the main subject, but which subsequently sits as a whole to revise the work of the sub-committees. Each Committee thus in the course of the second and third weeks prepares a report on the subject remitted to it, and also a series of resolutions. In the final two weeks of the Conference these reports and resolutions are considered by the whole Conference. After debate on each report, it is 'received' by the Conference, this indicating general approval of its contents, but without committing the Conference as a whole to the opinions expressed in it. If the Conference is seriously dissatisfied with a report, it may send

it back for further consideration and revision before consenting to receive it. The resolutions are then discussed and amended, and those that are passed go forth definitely as the opinion of the whole Conference.

On this occasion, the Committee on the Unity of the Church consisted of 73 bishops, under the chairmanship of Archbishop Temple, and was carefully arranged to include representatives of all schools of thought. Of the Indian bishops, the Metropolitan, and the Bishops of Dornakal, Madras, Rangoon and Colombo were members of the Committee, as well as Bishop Palmer.

The Committee had a sub-committee on the relation of the Anglican Communion to other episcopal Churches, and sixteen out of the twenty-nine resolutions finally passed dealt with this subject. It is important to notice this fact, because some friends had before the Conference felt that it would be difficult, or even impossible, for the Conference to make advances towards unity in two directions simultaneously. On the contrary, we all felt that we greatly gained by having this double outlook. Whatever the Committee has said in the report, or the Conference in the resolutions, in one direction, has been said in full view of what we were saying in the other direction, and thus we were saved from possible exaggerations (from our point of view) in either direction, and were assisted in working out a statement of the Anglican position which should do justice to the various strains of religious inheritance and experience which it includes and which we believe should find a place in any wider fellowship into which we may be led.

While, therefore, the sections of the report and the resolutions which deal with the South India proposals form a separate group, they should be read in conjunction with the other parts of the report and the other resolutions (both those relating to episcopal Churches and those relating to other movements towards union in the non-episcopal direction) which both help to interpret them and are interpreted by them. In this connection I must also mention certain parts of the report of another Committee—that on the Nature and Ideals of the Anglican Communion—and a resolution of this latter Committee which purports to define this term.

Coming now to deal directly with the report and the resolutions on the proposals for union in South India, the main result can be stated quite briefly.

The advice of the Lambeth Conference had been asked by the General Council and the Episcopal Synod of our Church in India on the Scheme as proposed and on the opinions they had framed thereon at Calcutta in January last. The Conference approves the leading principles of the Proposed Scheme, and expresses its 'strong

desire that as soon as the negotiations are successfully completed, the venture should be made and the union inaugurated.' The Committee 'generally endorses the resolutions passed by the General Council, and the opinions expressed by it with reference to the Proposed Scheme', and the Conference gives its general approval to the opinions and suggestions of the Committee.

Fuller mention must be made, however, of certain important points in which the report clarifies, or to some extent modifies the situation as previously understood on the Anglican side.

(1) The report points out that the present Anglican dioceses in South India will after the union 'not be Anglican dioceses in which we are asked to recognise elements foreign to the Anglican system; they would go forth from the Anglican Communion in order to make their own distinctive contribution to the faith and order of the united Church. Moreover, the Church in which those dioceses are to be embraced will be itself "a distinct Province of the Universal Church", with a rule and character of its own.' The united Church in South India, therefore, 'will not be a part of the Anglican Communion'.

To say this means two things, and does not mean a third thing.

(a) It means that the name 'Anglican Communion' is used to denote that group of Churches at present so called which have a special historical inter-connection and a common standard of doctrine and practice in the Book of Common Prayer (with slight local variations), and which, indeed, may be said in one sense to be one Church rather than a group of Churches, and not the fellowship of all Churches which may have different degrees of communion of fellowship with the Church of England. Some of us have perhaps wished to use the term 'Anglican Communion' in this latter meaning, and some name will in the future be required for this wider fellowship, but the Committee was doubtless right in advising that the name 'Anglican' should be kept to its present more restricted use, and the Conference accepted this view.

(*b*) It means that the independent position desired for the united Church is clearly recognized, and that there is no question of the proposed union meaning absorption.

(*c*) It does not mean that the united Church will not be in communion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion. No schism will be demanded on the Anglican side as the price of union.

(2) But what does the phrase 'in communion' mean? In the Proposed Scheme, it is stated that the united Church 'will seek to be in full communion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion', and there has been considerable discussion as to the meaning of 'full communion' and its relation to phrases such as 'communion and fellowship'. The Lambeth Committee, speaking of course from the

Anglican point of view, in effect analyses to some extent the idea of 'communion' between Churches of different histories and outlooks, and in doing so was considerably helped by the discussions on the side of the Orthodox Eastern and other episcopal Churches.

'Full communion', the Committee states, implies 'complete interchangeability of ministers and complete mutual admissibility to communion.' Now this may at present by unattainable for various reasons. On one side, it must be plainly stated that the Anglican Churches do not feel able to recognise the non-episcopal ministries as having that regularity and authorisation which would allow of complete interchangeability. On another side, even where two Churches give full mutual recognition to each other's ministries, differences of doctrine and practice may exist which make complete interchangeability of ministers desired by neither. This is, in fact (or is about to be) the case as between the Anglican and the Orthodox Eastern Churches, and there are analogous cases among non-episcopal Churches. Hence different types or degrees of communion between Churches may rightly be distinguished. In the immediate case, the Committee states the nature and degree of the communion which it hopes that the united Church would at once enjoy with the Churches of the Anglican Communion; this should be studied carefully, but is too long for me to quote here.

(3) That Churches should be in communion with each other also implies generally that their officials or other representatives should meet from time to time for common counsel. Accordingly, the Proposed Scheme has expressed the hope that invitations to the Lambeth Conference may be extended to the bishops of the united Church.

With regard to this, the Committee has made no definite suggestion. It has pointed out that the Lambeth Conference 'consists of Bishops in full communion with the Church of England and exercising oversight over the Anglican dioceses. But the united Church in South India will not be a part of the Anglican Communion'. One is to understand from this, not that the Committee recommends that the bishops of the united Church should not be invited to the Lambeth Conference—it has pointedly refrained from saying this—but that the time is not yet ripe to consider what should be done in the new circumstances which it is hoped will arise. Ten years hence there may be on the one side the united Church in South India, and on the other side the Orthodox Eastern and other episcopal Churches such as the Old Catholic and the Swedish, having various relations of communion and fellowship with the Churches of the Anglican Communion. One possibility is that the Lambeth Conference should become a Conference not of the Anglican Communion only but of a wider fellowship of Churches. On the other hand, it might be found better to set up

some separate conference to suit the new circumstances. The question will not arise until the time comes for the Archbishop of Canterbury to issue his invitations to the next Conference, and one cannot fortell what may have happened by then.

(4) I must refer briefly to two other points of some importance.

(*a*) The Committee makes a careful statement of what the Anglican Churches understand by 'the Historic Episcopate', and of the reasons for which we fell bound to insist upon it, while not asking that other bodies which come into closer relations with us should accept any one particular interpretation of it.

(*b*) One of the resolutions of the Conference adds to the general rule of the Anglican Churches that 'members of the Anglican Churches should receive the Holy Communion only from ministers of their own Church' a recognition of the principle that 'the administration of this rule falls under the discretion of the Bishop, who should exercise his dispensing power in accordance with any principles that may be set forth by the national, regional or provincial authority of the Church in the area concerned'. That is, the rule should not be regarded as one of unyielding rigidity, but as subject to exceptions in suitable circumstances and on special occasions where the ultimate purpose of the rule can thus be better served.

The same principle may rightly be held to apply to the working-out in practice of the pledge in Section IV. B. of the Proposed Scheme, which the Committee agrees with the General Council of the Church in India as securing that the rule that an episcopally ordained ministry is within our Church required for the due administration of Holy Communion will be preserved for those congregations which have in the past been bound by that rule.

To conclude, it would not be suitable for me to attempt to estimate how the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Church in South India will regard the advice and opinions of the Lambeth Conference and its Committee. To us Anglican bishops it is a cause for deep thankfulness and hope that our brother bishops in all parts of the world should have given us the generous approval and encouragement which are shown throughout the report and the resolutions. We regard it as an answer, fuller and more gracious than some of us had dared to expect, to the prayers which so many have been offering that the Holy Spirit should guide and control the work of the Lambeth Conference; and we look to the future with renewed assurance that God has purposes for the unity of His Church in South India and throughout the world in which He is allowing us to co-operate, and which, if we are faithful, He will allow us to see brought to visible fruition.

FREDERICK TINNEVELLY

Lambeth and South India

Question of Unity

By the BISHOP OF DORNAKAL

(The Right Rev. V. S. Azariah)

From the Church of England Newspaper

The Lambeth Conference of 1930 has just ended. The unanimity with which the Report and the Resolutions on South India were passed was something we hardly dared expect. The passing of the Resolutions was signalised by the Conference standing in silent thanksgiving, the offering of prayers and praises by the President and the singing of the Doxology.

It was an intense moment. It was clear that this happy result was brought about not by any compromising of principles; but by a process of patient explanation and mutual understanding of the facts of the situation, and a drawing together of hearts and minds by the operation of the Spirit of God. We began naturally with many misunderstandings. An amazing amount of literature had been produced against the South India scheme, misstating or suppressing facts, appealing to ecclesiastical prejudices and expressing the worst doubts and fears. The Conference rose above all these, patiently studied the issues involved in the Proposals, and were given the vision to decide this matter in faith and hope.

* * * * *

I. First of all, we thank God that general approval has been given to the Union Proposals. The Scheme has been declared to be on the right lines. 'The principles on which the scheme rests are considered capable of application in other fields.' It has been commended to all non-Episcopal Churches as indicating a way of meeting the difficulty of 'the interim period' before an unified ministry is obtained. The Conference has also endorsed the opinion given by the General Council of the Church of India, and in the light of that opinion, has confidently left to the Indian Bishops the task of fully working out the principles embodied in the Scheme. For this unequivocal expression of confidence in the Church of India, and this general approval of the lines on which that Church has taken part in the negotiations, we thank God.

II. We also gladly welcome the counsel given by the Committee on various points of the Scheme; these suggestions have been endorsed in one of the Resolutions. Of these the following particular points may be noted.

(*a*) To accept the Episcopate with the functions assigned to it in the Scheme, without any particular interpretation of Episcopacy has been deemed sufficient. The explanation given of the phrase 'Historic Episcopate' is bold and novel. The connotation of the term 'succession' as 'succession in office and succession of consecration' is most helpful and ought to assure our non-Episcopal brethren. Such an authoritative explanation ought to be a great comfort to many.

(*b*) The method of proceeding towards union by means of a pledge given in mutual trust in regard to locations of ministers is approved. Lambeth protects those who have been Anglican communicants, by declaring that they 'understand this pledge' to secure that the rule which the Anglican Church has inherited, (that an episcopally ordained ministry is, within our Church, required for the due administration of Holy Communion) will be preserved for the congregations which have in the past been bound by that rule. Lambeth has only stated what the negotiators have always understood by this provision.

(*c*) The principle of unification of ministers so that 'eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the United Church will be an episcopally ordained minister' is welcomed. The Committee suggests that since the actual words in the scheme dealing with this point have been challenged as indecisive, the words may be so modified as to put an end to all doubt. Similarly it has been suggested that the words referring to possible exceptions after the period of thirty years should be so modified as to make clear the present intention to reach finality in the unification of the permanent ministry.

(*d*) Lambeth also assents to the 'provision that acceptance of Confirmation should not be insisted on as a pre-requisite term of union.' As did the General council of the Church of India, Lambeth commends it—'both because of its association from the time of the Apostles, with the gift of the Holy Spirit, and also because of the benefit which it has bestowed on individual members of our Church and the enrichment which it brings to the pastoral ministry of the Bishop.' I am very thankful that this thorny question has been so wisely dealt with.

* * * * *

III. The Indian Joint Committee will rejoice at the advice given by Lambeth to the questions put to it by the Episcopal Synod.

(a) Lambeth quite approves of the situation—though anomalous —created by the provision that 'the Anglican Communion will be to a certain extent in communion with the united Church, which will itself be in communion with bodies not in communion with the Anglican Communion.' It believes that such a situation will be covered by the principle of 'economy.'

(*b*) Consecration *per saltum* is agreed to. 'Our view is,' says the Resolution, 'that while undesirable in the normal course of the Church's life, such consecration is not invalid, and in the special circumstances of the inauguration of the united Church is justifiable.' Non-episcopal ministers, therefore, may be consecrated Bishops, without previous ordinations to the Diaconate and the Priesthood.

(*c*) The Episcopal Synod of India asked Lambeth to say whether Confirmation was a pre-requisite of *Ordination*. The opinion is given that it is not.

(*d*) There was, lastly, the question of the participation of Presbyters in the Laying on of Hands at the consecration of Bishops. This proposal is regarded by Lambeth as perfectly legitimate in the inaugural service of Consecration. Such a participation will not invalidate any Consecration, though for subsequent Consecrations, Lambeth prefers that it be not adopted 'lest it should tend to confusion.' It is, however, suggested that 'if it be adopted, care should be taken to make it plain that the Presbyters do not take part as Consecrators,' as is made clear by the Church of Sweden which allows such a participation.

All this advice will bring immense relief and joy to all concerned. Of course the promoters of the Scheme hoped for these answers; and they will be glad that Lambeth has been led wholeheartedly to indicate these to be reasonable lines of action.

* * * * *

IV. We rejoice also for the Lambeth advice to us to go forward and inaugurate the union. '*We express to our brethren in India our strong desire, that as soon as the negotiations are successfully completed, the venture should be made and the union inaugurated.*' 'We hope that it will lead to the emergence of a part of the Body of Christ which will possess a new combination of the riches that are His. In this hope we ask the Churches of our Communion to stand by our brethren in India, while they make this experiment, with generous good-will.'

There was one point in the Report and Resolutions that came as a novelty to many of the Bishops; that was the statement regarding the relationship after union between the Church of India and the united Church. The negotiating Churches wanted the united Church to be autonomous—'free from any control, legal or otherwise, of any Church or Society external to itself.' The Scheme contemplated that the Dioceses entering union will have no organic connection with the northern Province of the Church of India. This absence of organic union (*i.e.* union in one Council and Synod) was 'accepted temporarily for the sake of unity.' The southern Dioceses were to be first separated into a Southern Province of the Church of India. This

Province was to be free to draw up the full Constitution for the united Church on the lines of the Scheme, and, on the acceptance of this Constitution by all concerned, to unite with the other Churches, thus forming one autonomous united Church of South India—free from control from the Church of India, Burmah and Ceylon, or from the Church of England.

* * * * *

This proposal has been heartily approved by the Lambeth Conference. It may even be stated that it was this provision that enabled the Conference to give its whole-hearted and unanimous approval for the Union to go forward on these lines.

Readers may recall, however, that it was this aspect of the Scheme that was proclaimed an act of schism. The Lambeth Resolutions and the Encyclical have, in consequence, taken some pains to repudiate the suggestion of schism.

Bournemouth Conference of the World Congregational Union—July 1930

Even from the necessarily inadequate reports contained in the Free Church organs so far to hand, it is very evident that the 5th International Conference of the Congregational body was an unqualified success. It was a conference really representative of World Congregationalism including delegates from America, Canada, Australia, China and India. Those present testify to the continuously high level of thought and inspiration maintained throughout the whole conference.

As already indicated in Volume I of this magazine, the selected theme was 'the Living Church', and all through the conference papers were read and discussion took place on subjects revolving around this main centre.

It was very apparent even early in the week that there would be many honest differences of opinion over the question of the basis of Church unity. Mr. Morgan Gibbon in his paper on 'the Protestant Witness of the Living Church' did not hesitate to express his vehement opinion regarding certain events that happened at Lausanne. He strongly regretted the fact that the 'Anglo-Roman' members of the Anglican Church, though present at Lausanne, refused to stay to the Communion service, and felt that for the Free Churches to talk of Union with a body separated from themselves by the whole width of the Lord's table was to talk sheer nonsense. Leaders of the Free Churches present at Lausanne were not spared Mr. Gibbon's severe censure.

Had Mr. Gibbon himself been present on that memorable occasion and had he understood more clearly the mind of the 'Anglo-Roman' party—that though they longed as heartily as the rest for this expression of their oneness in Christ with their Free Church brethren yet neither was it possible nor expedient at that time to take the desired step—we believe that Mr. Gibbon would have spoken differently.

This paper was followed by Dr. Ferdinand Blanchard's paper and the comment which appears in the *British Weekly* report is worth nothing—'the difference in emphasis that marked the two utterances served to reveal the fact that the issue is not so insistent on the other side of the Atlantic as it is on this side.'

It was not until Saturday morning, however, that the subject of Union really came before the Council. We quote the report contained in the *Christian World*. 'Dr. Vernon Bartlet's paper on the basis of unity began with an examination of the New Testament records, leading to the conclusion that the order of the transmission of the commission to administer the sacraments was not present in the Apostolic age, since at that time no continuance was expected, as Christ's immediate return to end the age was anticipated'. Dr. Bartlet dealt with the Free Church reactions to the Lambeth Conference appeal for Unity, the Lausanne Conference, and the South India proposals.'

In the discussion that followed sharp differences of opinion were soon manifest and Dr. Barton did not fail to delight the Council by his declaration that Congregationalists were just as competent as Lambeth bishops to say what the conditions of Union should be. 'If the Lambeth Bishops', he declared, 'draw a circle that keeps us out, we will draw a circle that keeps them in, and we will not count any Christian church as other than akin to us.'

It is perhaps unnecessary to remind ourselves of the obvious fact that neither the Lambeth Bishops nor Congregationalists, nor in fact any one body negotiating for Union, could claim or would wish to claim competence for laying down conditions of Union. All advance toward union must be made by mutual consultation and agreement. No consdieration appealing only to denominational feeling can be helpful.

J. V. Chelliah, Esq. Moderator of the S.I.U.C. was present and spoke on the union movement, showing how the Indians wished for a united Church and appealing that the West should not hinder the East in this movement. Rev. George Parker, formerly of Travancore also spoke in favour of union and these two addresses powerfully influenced the thought of the Council.

Rev. Kenneth L. Parry of Manchester followed with a plea that

Union should take the path of Federating such churches as Baptist, Congregational, Presbyterian and the great Methodist families which were closest in fellowship one with the other.

Dr. Garvie reminded the Council that the Anglican church had already stretched out a hand. 'Are we,' he enquired, 'to put our hands behind our backs?' The force of this remark would have been felt even more had the Conference been in possesion of facts that transpired subsequently at the sister conference at Lambeth.

At the close of the session the following message from the Council was unanimously adopted for transmission to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and this in itself reveals the fact that though differences of opinion may have existed as to conditions and method the Council was one in its desire to see Union consummated.

We, the members of the international Council of Congregationalists assembled for a decennial conference at Bournemouth, desire to convey to your Grace and the Bishops who will assemble at Lambeth our cordial Christian greetings.

We have prayed at our assemblies that in your deliberations you may be guided by the Spirit of God. We have prayed that out of your deliberations there may come decisions which shall be for the good, not only of your own great Church, but for the blessing of Christendom.

We remember with gratitude to God the appeal to all Christian people which issued from the last Lambeth Conference, and the impulse to Christian unity which it gave. Although organic union has not ensured, that appeal was abundantly blessed of God.

It helped us to appreciate one another, and it made the question of unity a living one for all our churches.

We in our Council have discussed this great and vital matter; you in your conference will discuss it once again. We have difficulties on our side; you have difficulties on yours.

But we desire to assure you that we, as well as you, feel the reproach that rests upon us, and the hindrances put in the way of the progress of the Kingdom of God by our unhappy divisions.

We, too, pray for the day when in God's good providence, and in His own perfect way, the difficulties in the way of complete fellowship shall be removed and we shall all be manifestly 'one,' that the world may know that our common Lord was in very truth the Sent of God.

The following is also an extract of the message forwarded to the Congregational churches of the world:—

Another great matter which occupied the attention of the Council was the relation of the various Christian churches to each other, and perhaps especially the relation of Congregationalism to Protestant Episcopalianism. We were unanimous in our belief in the real unity of Christ's believing people. The real Church of Christ transcends all the churches. We were unanimous, too, in our desire that the real underlying unity should reveal itself in fellowship—in fellowship expressing itself in such great acts as intercommunion.

But while eager for fellowship, the Council was again unanimous in feeling that it could not assent to union on the basis of any theory which made Episcopacy necessary for the existence of the Church. For the moment therefore, we must stand in our lot and maintain our witness to the freedom of the spirit—praying for the coming of the better day when all exclusive claims shall be renounced, and all Christian men shall be willing to say, 'Grace be unto all them who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.'

In the light of the discussions that took place and the resolutions that were formed it is perhaps true to suggest that the message that found its way to the hearts of all delegates present at Bournemouth was that finely stated by the Moderator at the very beginning of the Council;—'Let us practise fellowship . . . . that kind of unity need not wait'.

W. SCOPES.

Are we moving towards an *Impasse?*

The opinions and resolutions concerning the Proposed Scheme of Union passed by the General Assembly (S.I.U.C.), the Provincial Synod (Wesleyan Church) and the Episcopal Synod (Church of India) make one wonder if we are not moving towards an impossible position and consequent cessation of negotiations. The amendments proposed are intended mainly to preserve in the United Church the beliefs and practices of each of the three uniting Churches. Thus the Indian Anglicans want

(1) the United Church to admit that even an unworthy minister can celebrate a valid sacrament,

(2) that they should not be understood to have admitted 'the equally certain validity of all ministries',

(3) that the rule that 'an episcopally ordained ministry is required for the Sacrament of Holy Communion will be preserved for those congregations which have in the past been bound by that rule',

(4) that the United Church should adopt as early as possible the rite of confirmation,

(5) and that in the Holy Communion there should be deliberate consecration of the bread and wine used.

Similarly the Wesleyans desire

(1) that there should be a more definite and explicit statement that the Apostolic Succession shall not be a doctrine of the United Church,

(2) that the powers of the Bishop should be clearly defined and limited,

(3) that from time to time the Diocesan Council should express its opinion whether its Bishop is to continue in office in the diocese,

(4) that they would not cease to recognise the validity of the ministry of non-episcopal churches,

(5) and strongly recommend that inter-communion between the consulting Churches be encouraged even before Union takes place.

The General Assembly of the S.I.U.C. has recommended to its councils that

(1) they do not commit themselves to the position that episcopal ordination is the dividing line between a valid and an invalid ministry,

(2) the freedom of intercommunion and intercelebration shall not be restricted to any section of the Church or to the lifetime of the original ministers and members, and

(3) in framing the rules of the Diocesan Councils due consideration should be given to the views of the local churches.

It is evident that an attempt to incorporate all the above recommendations in the Proposed Scheme is doomed to failure. We cannot have a United Church in which everybody's belief shall be the belief of all. This does not mean that there is no hope of forming a United Church in S. India. It only shows that the way to union lies elsewhere. If each of the uniting Churches desires to remain within its own circle and at the same time pushes itself into proximity to other circles in which are other Churches, there cannot be real union. Each Church should erase its own small circle and help in drawing a larger circle to include the rest. In other words, we should cease upholding our own peculiarities, however valuable they may be to us, and care only for things that are of supreme importance to all.

Dr. A. C. Headlam, Bishop of Gloucester, has written a very helpful book on *Christian Unity* in which he indicates the lines of a wide circle which includes almost all Churches. For example, he maintains (1) that the historic creeds may be taken to be the standard of the Christian Faith which all accept, (2) that the theory of succession which prevails at the present time does not represent the original teaching of the Christian Church, (3) that we cannot quote Apostolic authority for episcopal or any other type of ministry, (4) that there is no justification for looking upon any form of ordination as essential for the celebration of the Eucharist, (5) and that the Sacraments should be looked upon as rites which we have to perform, and not as something about which it is necessary to hold a particular belief. As for the ministry, he proves from the writings of Hooker, Field and Andrews that the Church of England did consider in former days ministers who had not received Anglican form of ordination as ministers of the Church in the true sense of the word. He says, 'it was considered possible for those not episcopally ordained to hold office in the Church of England. . . . . there is quite sufficient testimony that it was widely held to be possible'. His finding with regard to the Apostolic Succession is quite illuminating. 'It is a succession by office and not by ordination. . . . . The succession did not mean any transmission of grace, it meant the transmission of the apostolic tradition. It was not the succession that made a bishop, but a bishop was one who was duly appointed to his office and thereby received the succession.'

It is abundantly clear that the S.I.U.Church and the Wesleyan Church are insisting that the United Church shall recognise for all time the validity of non-episcopal ordination. It is useless to try to avoid this issue by adopting ambiguous clauses and temporary measures. If the S.I.U.C. and the Wesleyan parts of the United Church are to enjoy full fellowship with the Congregational, the Presbyterian and the Wesleyan Churches of Great Britain and Ame-

rica, it means that for more than half the number of Churches in the United Church ordination by presbyters is valid. Dr. Headlam has shown that there is authority for this position in the past history of the Church of England. The Indian Anglicans are now called upon to exercise the liberty which they already possess. It has been repeatedly stated that the Anglican Church has advanced the cause of union considerably by agreeing to the statement in the Scheme 'that all the other ministers (other than bishops) of the uniting Churches in the area of union shall be acknowledged as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the United Church'. The other uniting Churches only ask that this acknowledgement be genuine and permanent. This is undoubtedly the crux of the situation. If the Church of India can sees its way to acknowledge the validity of ministries in other Churches the much desired union will be accomplished within a short time. It is a matter of regret that not all in that Church yet see that the barriers for union are of their own make and they have it within their power to pull them down.

India badly needs a United Church. If the Church in India is to grow and be a power in the land it should be marked by truth and liberty. The basis of union should be wide enough to include all who believe in the Lord Jesus. It is not wise at this stage to catalogue every conceivable duty and privilege of bishops and ministers. On the other hand we should expect the Church to learn these things by its life and service. Similarly with regard to ideas and explanations the Indian Church should have the privilege of a child to think afresh and arrive at its own conclusions. The Proposed Scheme of Union needs to be amended. The amendment should be for widening the basis of union and for giving full liberty to the United Church.

H. SUMITRA.

The Passion for Union

In the Wesleyan Conference Dr. Russell Maltby is reported as having said in criticism of the wording of a resolution on the South Indian Scheme, that it was 'almost worthy of our worst traditions'. 'I think', he said, 'such resolutions tend to become more and more bleached, more bereft of human colour, and more robbed of human passion.' The resolution in question was the statement 'The Committee believes that organic union is in the interests of the Kingdom of God in India'. It is perhaps permissible to suggest that the validity of Dr. Maltby's criticism depends upon a weakening of the meaning of one of the great words of religion : 'I believe' : many would not

accept the view that the recitation of a creed is necessarily 'bleached' and colourless, and it is possible even for this resolution to have something of the colour and excitement of a trumpet blast. There are difficulties in the framing of resolutions, as Dr. Maltby well knows, but whatever may be said for or against this particular form of words, most of those who are in favour of the Union proposals would join with the Conference in hearty approval of the thought behind his criticism. For if Union is to come, it must come not merely or chiefly as the result of the careful deliberations of committees, but because of a passion that cannot be resisted, a passion that is the moving of the Spirit of God Himself. Those who have taken part in the work of the Joint Committee on Union have borne impressive testimony to the fact that for them there has been the consciousness of this dominating and exhilarating pressure from God; it is a testimony that cannot be gainsaid, and the experience once realised cannot be forgotten or disregarded. There is something of the immediacy of the experience of personal salvation about this other experience, of the unity of Spirit that actually exists between those who have been in consultation together. It may be that it ultimately defies analysis; but it is perhaps worth while to consider what is meant by the opening words of Section III of the Scheme, on the Basis of Union. 'The uniting Churches are assured that the unity of His Church for which Christ prayed is a unity in Him and in the Father through the Holy Spirit, and is therefore fundamentally a reality of the spiritual realm. They seek the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. . .' How does this unity actually take shape in thought on the mission field, over against other systems of religious thought and practice?

There is a sense in which all religiously minded men are on one side as contrasted with all secularly and materialistically minded men on the other. The Jerusalem Conference made it clear enough that the great struggle in the world to-day is between religion and secularism; to preserve the world from atheism and irreligion may be regarded as the prime concern of the man for whom religion is the great reality, bringing him into relation with the Eternal. Fellowship of very great value is possible on that basis, and is being enjoyed to-day in India by Christians with Hindus and Muhammadans and others. But the Christian does not subscribe to the facile teaching that all religions are alike and of equal value; he does not of course regard men of other faiths as enemies, he gives no place in his heart to a sense personal superiority, or to any pride of possession in his religion; but he is sure that there is something distinctive in Christianity, and it is his desire, and indeed an inescapable obligation laid upon him, that he shall share his distinctive truth and Gospel with others. It

is here that the true basis of union is to be found, to be found perhaps more readily and to be acted on perhaps more decisively where there is a conflict of religious beliefs and practices of widely differing kinds, than in a nominally Christian society where differences are in the main on secondary issues, allowed to be magnified in the absence of the challenge of other religious views of life.

The distinctive elements in Christianity may be very variously expressed; but it may safely be said that at the centre there is an attitude to certain facts which is common to Christians and only to Christians. The life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ are for Christians the central events in the history of the world: Christians hold them to be of cosmic importance. God there decisively and uniquely entered human life, so that at that point there is something that can be called a new creation. The Christian is sure about this, not merely or chiefly on intellectual grounds, but because for him there has come through Jesus Christ an experience of peace and harmony and renewal, a sense of direction in an otherwise hopelessly confused world, which depends somehow on the view of God and man and man's destiny that comes out of the facts of Jesus; this is salvation. And further, this knowledge and experience cannot be kept as a monopoly by the Christian; in its essence it is enriched by being shared, and hopelessly and fatally impoverished if regarded selfishly. The light that comes from Jesus shows us that God is the Father of all men, and that He would have all the human race in the happy fellowship of His family.

In comparison with these tremendous and eternal realities,—the trust placed in the hands of all Christians,—and in face of a world needing just such a Gospel to be brought to it with a passionate certainty, the differences that divide the churches ought not to loom so large. It would be idle to deny that the differences are there and that a number of them are of great importance; but in proportion as we keep our attention and devotion fixed on the central and saving truth of our Gospel the importance of the differences tends to dwindle. There is no expectation that all who seek for union in this present scheme will come to think alike about many of the points of difference; no attempt is made to hide the differences or to compromise on anything that affects principles; but with the frankest recognition that inherited and temperamental differences are likely in many cases to continue, we seek to realise our fundamental unity more fully, and to liberate the energies of the Church for its great task of witnessing to the world.

J. S. M. HOOPER.

What is the Alternative?

It is sometimes said by members of the South India United Church that we have taken the wrong course in our efforts for Church Union. Our natural affinity is with other Free Churches and we ought first to have sought union with them.

A brief glance at the history of the movement will show how mistaken this view is. Since the movement began in 1901 we have gone on step by step, and have entered such doors as were opened for us. First of all Presbyterian joined with Presbyterian, on a small scale in the South, and afterwards in an All-India Union. Soon those in the South whose ancestry was in the main congregational united, and then, in 1908, came the union of these two streams. This was something to be thankful for, but we were not satisfied that the end had been reached. Soon after the consummation of the union the Churches of the Church of Scotland Mission came in, and a little later the Malabar section of the Basel Mission Church. During these early years there were some preliminary conversations with a view to carrying the movement further—with the Ceylon and India General Mission and the Wesleyan Synod of South India—but neither of these proposals came to anything. Then came the Tranquebar Conference of 1919, which revealed a possibility of union with the Church of England. I need not record the steps that followed, for this has already been done in the Historical Sketch contained in the first number of *Church Union*. What I wish to emphasise is that we entered into the negotiations with the Church of England in accordance with a definite proposal made by a number of ministers of our own and other Churches, and approved in substance by our General Assembly. We could not tell whether the negotiations would come to anything, but at least we had an opportunity, and the General Assembly resolved to try what could be done. No such opportunity offered itself in the case of any other Church. There had been some informal conversations with members of some of them, but no hope had been held out that any organic union would be possible.

Yet we did not forget the other Churches of the South, and when some progress had been made in the negotiations the General Assembly of 1923 (Jaffna) passed the following resolution:

> Believing that the aim of our Union negotiations should, under God's guidance, be the building up of a comprehensive United Church of Christ in South India and Ceylon, the General Assembly instructs its Union Committee to approach such Churches as are believed to be sympathetic with this ideal, with a view to securing their interest and co-operation.

In accordance with this a letter was sent out to most of the Churches of the South, informing them of the progress that had been made, and asking for their prayerful interest in the further negotiations. The letter also contained an invitation to any Church that wished to join in the negotiations to do so, and a further invitation to any who wished to attend the future meetings to do so even if they were not authorised by their Church to take any part.

Of this letter over twenty copies were sent out, but the response was most disappointing. The only bodies which replied were the Synod of the Wesleyan Church and the Conference of the Danish Mission. The latter expressed interest, but went no further. The former indicated a desire to join with us in the negotiations, and accordingly the Wesleyan Synod has been represented at every subsequent meeting of the Joint Committee.

It is surely obvious that by their failure even to acknowledge receipt of the letter sent from the General Assembly the other Churches made it clear that they were not ready to consider any proposal for organic union.

Years have passed, and it may be said that those who showed no interest then may be interested now. Of this, however, we have no indication. Some modification of attitude there may have been, but it has not been enough to give any hope of union. Of the Baptists, who form the largest community in South India, not many are ready to leave the questions of the subjects of baptism, and the mode of its administration, open, and if they are not what union between Baptists and other Churches is conceivable? Nor are the Lutherans, for the most part, willing to be organically united with those who differ from their Sacramental teaching. There remains only one considerable Church in South India—the Methodist Episcopal—and the recent discussions in North India show how far that body is from any idea of entering into organic union with any Indian Church.

It may be said that while these doors are closed there is one which is open. Why not, it is asked, unite organically with the United Church of Northern India, which corresponds in many respects with the South India United Church? The answer is that such a union, even if it could be accomplished would have little practicable value. In this matter we can speak from experience. For four years (1904-1908) the Presbyterians of the South were in organic union with the Presbyterians of the North, and some of us have pleasant recollections of Assemblies in Calcutta, Indore and other distant places. But when we had to choose between remaining in this All-India fellowship, and giving it up in order to enter into organic union with our Congregational neighbours in the South, we unhesitatingly chose the latter, and the union has meant very much more than the All-India Union could ever have done.

So it is now. It will benefit us little if for the sake of a union with people in the Punjab and Bombay we refuse to enter a union in our own area. The Anglicans are our neighbours. Their Churches and ours are in many cases interlaced. If we remain in separation the stumbling block of disunion remains. If we unite there is every reason to hope for a great enrichment of the Church's life. The only union worth having is one which will bring us into organic union with our fellow-Christians in our own area.

What then is our answer to the question which constitutes the title to this article? We are shut up to this: we may either enter an open door; or we may refuse to enter, and try to force a number of doors which at present are closed. The former is the view we have hitherto taken. Not that the previous steps were always easy. They were not, but step by step we were led to a wider union. We did not waste time with negotiations which could not come to anything, but set ourselves to overcome the difficulties which stood in the way of organic union with those who were willing to consider it. Is not this the attitude we should take still? The difficulties in the way are still considerable, but the past experience of the Church leads us to hope that they are not insuperable. We may fail, but if so we must not console ourselves with the idea that we have some alternative to fall back upon.

J. H. MACLEAN

Telugu Church Council

Discussion on the 'Proposed Scheme of Union'

At the annual meeting held in Jammalamadugu on July 8th-12th, 1930, the Telugu Church Council gave two days to the consideration of the 'Proposed Scheme of Union.'

At the 1929 Council it was resolved that special arrangements be made for this year's meetings, so as to ensure ample time for discussing the Scheme. During the year opportunity had been taken to explain and discuss the 'Proposed Scheme' at Divisional Committees and Summer Schools throughout the area. Thus, when the Council met on July 8th, they took up the 'Scheme' as their most important item of business.

The first day was given to group discussion of the proposals. The Council was divided into five groups, and each group was instructed to give special attention to the Episcopacy outlined in the Scheme, as acceptance or rejection of that particular section would decide the necessity or otherwise of proceeding further with the consideration of

the details of the Schme. Each group was also requested to appoint an Indian member to act as spokesman when the recommendations of the group were brought to the Council for final consideration.

Late in the afternoon the Council met again to receive the reports of the various groups.

All the five groups were unanimous in the expression of their sincere desire for union, but with regard to the basis of the proposed union,—especially that of the Episcopacy advocated in the Scheme—not one group felt able to accept it.

Two groups expressed the opinion that more time for the study of the Scheme was needed, and recommended that final action on the Scheme be postponed until the next Council meeting in 1931, and that, meanwhile, the Scheme be translated into Telugu and copies distributed among the Churches.

Two groups strongly expressed the opinion that the Episcopacy outlined in the Scheme not only tends towards the absorption of one body by the other and cannot form the basis of a real lasting union, but also that it made further union with other non-episcopal Christian communities impossible. Therefore they could not agree to the Episcopacy laid down in the 'Proposed Scheme' as a basis of union.

The remaining group held that the Episcopacy of the 'Scheme' is not the *Constitutional* Episcopacy to which the Telugu Church Council, for the sake of union, agreed in 1923; and, therefore, in spite of their great desire for union, they cannot agree to the Scheme. Further, they expressed their belief that no one particular form of Church Government, such as the Episcopal, is essential to real union, and that in any scheme for a real living union, room must be allowed for all forms of Church government. They therefore, recommended that in place of the present 'Scheme', steps might be taken, along lines similar to those already obtaining in the South India United Church, towards the formation of a Federated Church of India.

All these recommendations from the groups were discussed at length in the full meeting of the Council. During the discussion it became very evident that, once again, the main stumbling block was the Episcopacy outlined in the Scheme.

Some of the main grounds on which the rejection of the 'Scheme' was urged may be summarised as follows:

(1) The Episcopacy upon which the Scheme is based will not lead to a real lasting union, but will tend inevitably to mould the Indian Church of the future into one particular form of ecclesiasticism.

(2) It will separate us from our brethren in other communities who are more closely related to us in matters of faith and order than the Anglicans.

(3) The resultant Church of the 'Proposed Scheme' will be exclusive rather than inclusive.

(4) The Episcopacy outlined in the Scheme is not the Constitutional Episcopacy to which the Telugu Church Council, for the sake of union, agreed eight years ago.

The trend of the Council's thought was in the direction of a fuller and wider union than is proposed in the present Scheme,—a development of the union which we have already in the South India United Church, which would result in the creation of a great Federated Church of India. During the discussion it became clear that the Council is not in the least interested in the things that divide them from their fellow Christians, but is intensely interested in everything which helps towards the realization of the brotherhood of all Christians.

At the close of the second day's discussion two proposals were before the Council, namely—

(1) That the proposed scheme be rejected, and the final vote be taken forthwith.

(2) That the final decision be deferred until the next Council in July 1931.

In the voting that followed it was resolved by a vote of 29-16 to postpone the final decision until the next Council meeting. Nine members did not record their votes.

The voting strength of the Council was 54, the proportion of Indian and European members being 47 Indians and 7 Europeans.

LEWIS THOMAS.

Book Reviews

'The Call for Christian Unity'

With a view to educating Christian opinion in general upon the subject of the present urgent need for the closer co-operation of Christian forces throughout the world, and of focussing the attention of the Lambeth Conference in particular upon the present unique opportunity for enlarging Christian fellowship among the churches presented by the Lausanne and Jerusalem Conferences, and the proposals for organic union among the churches in South India, as also in Persia, and in China, a volume of essays under the title of *The Call for Christian Unity* has been written and published by a group of Liberal Evangelicals in the Church of England.

These essays are not only of the greatest value because of the mass of relevant facts collated from the past history of the Church as well as from modern movements towards unity, they will also prove a real inspiration to continue to explore the paths of Christian thought and service, should the

present schemes for organic union prove to be not the best, nor the practicable way to that effective witness and that united communion which were never more clearly seen to be the duty as well as the privilege of the Christian Church than is evident to-day.

The facts of Church history have been faced with a courageous freedom from bias, and the implications accepted with a ready response.

It seems all the more difficult therefore for a Free-Churchman to understand, when the way to union seems so clear upon paper, why there should be allowed to stand in the way so many obstacles to union in fact.

One reason may be, as rightly said by Dr. Carnegie Simpson in his Free Church Presentation in the series, 'A union movement cannot live on conferences and declarations alone, but the words of union must be accompanied by acts of union.'

Another difficulty which makes for confusion of thought and hinders progress is that instead of the word 'Union' so often 'Re-union' is spoken of as the goal of our endeavour. But the term 'Re-union' with all the connotation that that has gathered round it is misleading.

In an interesting essay upon the situation in China by Prof. Francis Cho. Min.Wei. we read: 'If human nature works in the same way in China as in other parts of the world there will be differences among the Chinese Christians similar to those which have caused denominational division of the Church in the West. . . . All the major questions concerning the united Church in China ought to be decided by the Chinese Christians when they are able to make their really representative opinions on Church affairs articulate.

Without speculating too much in the meantime, we would venture the suggestion that to try to found the Chinese United Church on such doctrines as the Apostolic Succession is simply to court failure. As far as we can gauge the signs of the times, it is not likely that episcopacy will be the form of ecclesiastical polity for the Chinese Church of the future.'

On the other hand, in an essay by Dr. Linton, Bishop in Persia, it is stated that as one of the fundamental principles of union drawn up by the inter-church conference in 1927 the following was adopted: 'We feel that in the United Church of Persia the offices of "Episcopos" and "Presbuteros", both mentioned in the New Testament, should be preserved in some form, and that at the same time the rights of the local congregation, in accordance with New Testament teaching should be fully guarded, so as to produce and preserve the harmonious working of the whole body of the Church and to prevent undue concentration of power in the hands of a single person or group of persons.'

In the essay upon the situation in India by Canon Davies, 'Episcopacy in a constitutional form is taken as an accepted item in union schemes by each of the churches contemplating union as the factor best calculated to link together congregations, in a land in which unity, social, racial, political, and religious, is the supreme need, and where the divisions between Christians are therefore peculiarly deplorable.'

In a most usful historical survey of Non-episcopal ministries in the essay by the Archdeacon of Coventry, we are reminded that John Hooper, Bishop of Gloucester, wrote: 'I believe the Church is bound to no sort of ministers or any ordinary succession of bishops. . . .but unto the only Word of God.' So also Cranmer: 'The ministers of God's word under his majesty be the bishops, parsons, vicars, and such other priests as be appointed. . . .in the admission of many of these officers be divers comely

ceremonies and solemnities used, which be not of necessity, but only for a good order, and seemly fashion', and John Jewel, the learned Bishop of Salisbury: 'God's grace is not promised to sees and successions, but to them that fear Him.'

The Archdeacon maintains that 'while the authorities strove to secure uniformity with regard to ordination in England, they by no means questioned the validity of the orders of the reformers overseas, . . .non-episcopal though they were. *And this recognition has never been withdrawn.'*

In accordance with this 'up to 1594 numbers had been admitted to the ministry of the Church, with no better than Presbyterian ordination.' One such became the Dean of Durham, and three became Bishops in Scotland.

In 1618 Bishop Andrews wrote: 'Though our government be by Divine Right, it follows not, either that there is no salvation or that a Church cannot stand without it. He must be stone blind that sees not Churches standing without it; he must needs be made of iron and hard-hearted that denies them salvation.' Then, (in the essay on Reunion and the Primitive Church) 'to what does it all point? If the monarchial episcopate was a development to meet the growing needs of the Churches, both as a unifying principle and a guarantee of orderly progress, then it follows that the episcopate is of the *bene esse* and not of the *esse* of the Church. And if this be so, profoundly as we may believe in the episcopal form of government. . . .we shall not dare to affirm that the non-episcopal Churches possess orders which are not valid—inasmuch as they are conferred by the laying on of hands and by the prayers of the people—nor the Sacraments administered in such Churches have not the true essentials of the Sacraments.'

'True unity lies ever before and never behind' so 'Unity, when it comes, must be something richer, grander, more comprehensive, than anything we see at present.' (Edinburgh Conference 1910.)

It is impossible within the limits prescribed for this review to deal at all adequately with so many sided a presentation of the whole subject, so emphasis has been given to 'The Ministry' as that forms to a large extent the crux of the whole question of organic union, and such is not a mere squabble between the clergy and ministers of the churches, but forms a matter in which the laity and congregations are equally and vitally concerned and interested.

RALPH ROBERTSON.

Christian Unity. By Arthur Cayley Headlam, Lord Bishop of Gloucester. Student Christian Movement, London.

The Bishop of Gloucester is perhaps the most learned of all the Bishops of the Anglican Communion, and therefore anything that he writes is deserving of study, especially by members of other churches. This book well exemplifies the peculiarly Anglican virtue of sobriety. Perhaps it would have been better, if it had not been reviewed by an Anglican, especially an Anglican whose view-point is so very closely allied to that of the Bishop.

We may select first some merits of the Bishop's exposition of his subject.

1. *It is large-hearted.* The particular claims and interests of many churches are passed in review, and for almost every one, the Bishop has some generous word of appreciation. Perhaps he is hardest on the Anglo-Catholic members of his own communion, who will hardly be pleased to be

told that they hold 'a curious selection of opinions' which 'have really no authority, except that of the individuals who teach them' and which 'are held with a tenacity in inverse proportion to their importance.'

2. *It is practical.* The Bishop constantly emphasises the need for facing the facts. For example: the Anglican is perectly certain that he is a member of the Universal Church; but so is the Presbyterian, or the Wesleyan, and the Anglican has no right to set himself up as a judge and critic of other men's Christian consciousness, especially in the face of all the facts.

3. *It is Christo-centric.* The great danger in all Reunion discussions is that they tend to strengthen and clarify church-consciousness, and to lead the mind away from the real purpose of Christ in the institution of the church. Dr. Headlam is very well aware of this danger, and counters it by frequent reference back to the standards, teaching and practice of Christ Himself.

4. *It is positive.* He insists all the time that our eyes must not be fixed on details, on exact agreement in every point; our only hope of union is to concentrate on the fundamentals and to go forward. The attitude of the church should be courageous, rather than timid and over-conservative.

In passing, it may be mentioned that the Bishop gives explicit and thorough approval to the S. India Scheme. If all the Bishops assembled at Lambeth shared Dr. Headlam's views, the Conference would no doubt send the scheme on with hearty benedictions and scarcely an amendment.

On the other hand, in a book dealing with so many controversial matters, it is natural that there should be many causes of disagreement. Most Anglicans would hold that Dr. Headlam has, on the subject of the ministry, given away too much. Even those who do not maintain any rigid theory of Apostolic Succession attach more weight to Episcopacy than he appears to do. Granted that in the earliest days of the church, there was considerable variety in church order; it is quite certain that by the middle of the second century, Episcopacy was, and continued to be for fourteen centuries, the recognized, normal, and in most churches the only, form of church order. It is this argument which convinces the ordinary Anglican mind that there is about Episcopal orders a dignity and value, which is not possessed by the orders of any non-Episcopal church.

STEPHEN NEILL.

Report of Anglican Committee on Findings of the Lausanne Conference. (Church Assembly Church House, 3 *s.*)

Most of the Churches that were represented at Lausanne have studied the Findings of that Conference and have made reports thereon to the Continuation Committee. For the Church of England the Archbishops of Canterbury and York appointed a committee who have gone into the study of those Findings most carefully and have presented a report giving the attitude of the Church of England toward those Findings. The report itself covers only 44 pages of the pamphlet. The rest of the 162 pages are given up to appendices in which various members of the Committee express their own views with reference to problems that have arisen in the report. In many respects these appendices are more valuable than the report itself for in the nature of things the report is a compromise between persons holding almost opposite views with reference to the questions that have been raised, while in the appendices individual members of the Com-

mittee report that their own views on the problems involved. Among these appendices perhaps the most valuable are 'The Number of Sacraments' by Bishop Palmer, 'The Validity of the Sacraments' by Bishop Gore, 'The Meaning of Validity' by Bishop Palmer, 'The Meaning and Conditions of Validity' by the Rev. Canon Quick, 'Reunion in the Mission Field' by the Rev. Canon Davies, 'The Proposed Scheme of Union in South India' by Bishop Palmer, 'Comments on these Proposals' by Bishop Gore and 'Notes on the Christian Ministry and the Theory of Orders' by Bishop Headlam.

The Discussion on Validity is especially interesting and no doubt that subject is being studied most carefully by members of the Church of England in order that they may find some definition which will enable them either to limit validity to Episcopal orders or to extend validity to non-Episcopal orders. But one cannot help thinking when reading these articles that what the Church needs today is neither lexicographers to find the original meaning of words nor lawyers to interpret their exact legal content and application. What the Church needs today is men who are so filled with the power of the Spirit that they can preach the Gospel, convict men of sin and bring them into fellowship with Jesus Christ. The measure of any ministry or any Sacrament or any ordinance within the Christian Church cannot today be measured merely by its historicity. The Church to-day wants reality and that reality resides in the power of the Spirit manifested through those connected with the Church.

Looking at this report from the standpoint of South India we must admit the tremendous debt we owe to Bishop Palmer, formerly of Bombay and throughout all its negotiations a member of the Joint Committee. We thank God for the thought and prayer and love that Bishop Palmer has put into this work and we rejoice exceedingly at the clarity of his thought which has resulted from his close study of all the questions involved and his loyalty to the truth as he has seen it not merely in the past history of his own Church but in the living realities of other Churches.

The Rise of the Christian Church. Volume I. (Cambridge University Press. 7 *s.* 6 *d.*)

Under the general editorship of Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D., F. B.A., a group of modern scholars have decided to issue a series of three volumes dealing with the question of the Christian Religion, Its origin and Progress. Volume I deals with the subject *The Rise of the Christian Church* and it contains three parts, Part I, dealing with *The Jewish People and their Faith;* Part II, *The Earliest Christian Church;* and Part III *Early Traditions about Jesus.*

The purpose of these three volumes is to enable teachers in schools to have available a series of books that may be used either as text books or as reference books for children which will enable them to get a correct view of the history of Jesus and the Christian Church.

The authors have certainly produced an interesting volume. It is simple, direct and fascinating. At the end of each chapter books for further reference are listed. No doubt a great many earnest Christians will find fault with the volumes because they are radically modern, and no doubt some genuine scholars also will scarcely agree with some of he conclusions in this volume.

Documents on Christian Unity. Second Series. Edited by G. K. A. Bell, Bishop of Chichester (Oxford University Press).

Dr. Bell has again laid all men interested in the subject of 'Christian Unity' under a deep debt to himself for the painstaking care with which he has brought together official documents, dealing with unity, that have been issued since his first volume appeared. In this volume there are documents coming from (1) the World Conference on Faith and Order, (2) The Roman Catholic Church (conversations at Malines) (3) The old Catholic Churches, (4) The Church of England and the Free Churches, (5) The Moravian Church, (6) South India and (7) The Universal Christian Conference on Life and Work (Stockholm.)

These documents are all fully attested and are therefore authoritative. With reference to South India the whole of the 'Proposed Scheme of Union' is published together with the resolutions of the South India United Church General Assembly, the Wesleyan Methodist Provincial Synod, and the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. Those desiring official information on world movements should not be without this book.

The Church of England and the Church of Christ. By A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Archdeacon of Auckland. (Longmans, Green & Co., 3 *s.* 6 *d.*)

This pamphlet is one of many that have been published in which the author has tried to set forth his conception of the Church of England with special reference to the fact that the Lambeth Conference would soon meet. He tries to answer such questions as 'Does the Church of England possess genuine internal cohesion and unity'? 'To what is the Anglican Church really committed in matters of doctrine, and for what does it stand'? 'Has it any intelligible *raison d'etre* as a specific variant of the Christian tradition in the midst of a Christendom which more and more seeks after unity'?

Dr. Rawlinson tries his very best to show what he conceives to be the very reasonable and valuable position of the Church of England and has many things to say which can bear not only careful reading but also most careful study and reflection. Though he manifests his own personal predilections he does freely quote from those who do not agree with him and tries his best to understand their point of view though he cannot accept their conclusions.

Lausanne, Lambeth and South India. By N. P. Williams, D.D., Professor of Divinity in Oxford. (Longmans and Green. 2 *s.* 6 *d.*)

The course of the argument involves touching upon the more immediate problems with which the Anglican Communion is confronted with the result that this memorandum has become more than the original essay that it was intended to be and is laid before English Churchmen in the hope that it may contribute towards the clarification of some of the issues implicit in the title. Dr. Williams evidently does not accept the idea that the Church of England should enter into fellowship with other Churches unless they very carefully guard the apostolic ministry and the sacraments under their care. He does evidently realise the importance of the present movement towards Church Union but is rather fearful both of Lausanne and South India and agrees rather with Bishop Gore than with Dr. Streeter and Bishop Headlam in the interpretation of the Church, its Ministry and Sacraments.

Before We Meet at the Lambeth Conference. By the Rt. Rev. Neville S. Talbot, D.D., M.C., Bishop of Pretoria. (Longmans and Green & Co.)

This little booklet is written deliberately with the Lambeth Conference of 1930 in view. Bishop Talbot desires very earnestly that his fellow-bishops shall see the importance of coming to right decisions especially on the question of Church Union. Holding Anglo-Catholic views he naturally does not approve of what he calls Christian Reunion as it is proposed in South India. Dr. Talbot admits the difficulty of approving any particular doctrine or theory by reference to the Church Fathers and the New Testament since he says 'You can prove anything out of Church History'. He feels strongly that the whole question of Christian Reunion has to do with the whole Body of Christ, Roman Catholicism included, and therefore deprecates any sectional unions that might jeopardize this all-embracing reunion.

Clippings

The History of Church Union in North India

By Rev. J. FRASER CAMPBELL, D.D.

(From The Indian Witness, July 10, 1930)

At a Missionary Conference in the Punjab, late in 1862, the Rev. Dr. John Newton read an essay on 'An Indian Catholic Church' in which he said as a *first step* the Presbyterian Churches should unite.

In 1863, an Elder of the Church of Scotland, Calcutta, Mr. J. T. Maclagan, a Bengal civilian, issued a 'plea for a Presbyterian Church of India.'

On 13th November, 1865, the Synod of Northern India of the American Presbyterian Mission, at Umbala, appointed a Committee to correspond on the subject with the Presbyterian Churches in India.

On 19th December, 1868, this Committee reported favourable replies.

On 8th January, 1871, a Conference met in Allahabad and appointed another Conference on the 16th November. At this, 33 ministers and 4 elders met and emphasized the importance of a corporate union of all Presbyterians as a *first step* to a *United Indian Church*; though its immediate accomplishment was thought impossible.

In December 1872, 41 ministers and elders, representing eight Presbyterian Churches, favoured a consociation for consultation and co-operation.

In November 1873, another Conference resulted in the formation of the Indian Presbyterian Alliance—consultative and advisory—to meet every two years and to start *The Indian Standard*.

In 1875 another Conference settled a constitution, one of its objects being to prepare the way for an organic Union among the native Presbyterian Churches in India.

In 1877 the first Council of the Alliance was held and in the next twelve years four more—in 1880 the second, in December 1883 the third, in December 1886 the fourth and in December 1889 the fifth.

All seemed going well for an organic Union of all the Presbyterian Churches till, at the meeting in 1889, in Calcutta, a bomb was thrown into our midst by a 'Modernist' speech. The Movement stopped. And though nearly a decade later it was again started, one at least of the most spiritual and successful Missions never came in.

In the July 1898 issue of the *Indian Standard* I wrote in the editorial notes 'what about our Union in India? Nearly ten years ago we seemed far on the way toward its consummation. Is it not time for it to be taken up again and also for the Presbyterian Alliance to be revived?'

On 27th September, 1900, a very few of us met in Landour and resolved to call for a meeting of the Alliance.

It met in Allahabad on 9th February, 1901 and appointed Committees to prepare a Basis of Union.

From my diary I see that on Friday, 27th September 1901, at Saharanpur I worked about eight hours with Doctors Chatterjee, Wherry and Taylor (of Ahmedabad) and Mr. Robert Morrison in one Committee, on Saturday for ten hours on two committees, on Monday six hours on Committees, and then to Landour. Next day was spent in getting off matter for the *Indian Standard* and writing out the minutes of the Committee on Doctrine.

In December the Alliance and committees met in Allahabad and took a step forward.

And here it will interest you to hear a resolution, passed with acclamation by the C.M.S. Conference, Punjab and Sind: '*Congratulations.* This reference rejoices heartily at the successful issue of the Conference of thirteen Presbyterian bodies, which met last month to form one Presbyterian Church for the whole of India. It earnestly trusts that this achievement marks but the beginning of still wider movements towards reunion, and pledges itself to use every means both by prayer and effort, to bring about closer relations between the various branches of the Church of Christ.'

And yet three years passed before, on 19th December 1904, at Allahabad, the Union was actually consummated, and the first General Assembly met, of the Presbyterian Church in India.

Later the Walsel Mission in Assam, which that year met at Sylhet passed the following Resolution which was later followed by the formal consummation of their Union with us:—

'With reference to the question of Union with the Presbyterian Church in India, believing that it is the will of our Lord and Master Jesus Christ, we resolve to unite; believing also that such a Union will meet the approval of the General Assesmbly in Wales, we seek its sanction and ask for its blessing on our decision.'

And finally, in December 1924 the Congregational brethren connected with the American Marathi Mission united with us, accepting our Confession of Faith or creed in substance. I had the honour of moving the final, formal Resolution in our United Assembly. And it was the last Assembly I have attended. Though hitherto working a little on the Union Committee I have ceased attending the Assembly since becoming an octogenarian and so I shall leave to Mr. Graham to tell you of hopeful progress since, towards Union with other branches of Christ's one Church.

In conclusion let me remind you that, from the first, the hope has been for an Indian Catholic Church, as the sainted Dr. John Newton phrased it. Of course he knew there would be those who, while claiming the name Catholic, would use it wrongly. He meant, and we mean, a visible undivided Church of Christ.

So in 1871 it was agreed that a Union of Presbyterians was to be a *first step* to a *United Indian Church.*

Personally may I say that when I was first invited to join the Presbyterian-Alliance I expressed the hope that it would be a step towards a Union of all evangelical Christians. From boyhood such a Union has been my conviction and desire. I worked for it in Canada and I have sought it in India.

(Several paragraphs follow in this article explaining the present union in N. India, but these are omitted for lack of space. (*Editor.*)

Dr. Garvie's Opinion

Of the resolutions passed by the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, printed in our last issue, Dr. A. E. Garvie writes:

On the scheme itself I have already offered my judgment in the January number of the *Review of the Churches.* While in two respects it does not attract me—its markedly European type and its over-emphasis of authority, especially of the bishops—I do not find in it any features which should prove an insuperable objection to its acceptance, if the Indian Churches approve. While the report of the General Council does seem to me to move even more in the same direction, it does not leave me hopeless as regards the possibilities of final adjustment in view of the genuinely Christian spirit which pervades it.

On a few points some further comment seems necessary. The stress on 'the full Catholic heritage' seems to me a mistake, as I agree with the Bishop of Gloucester that, in the present divided state of Christendom, no Church can claim that possession in contrast to others. To declare the two Sacraments as 'generally necessary to salvation' would seem to me to be provocative. Would the position be secured by some such change as 'the appointed means of grace through which God generally works in us' (Section III A, p. 3)?

In my article I have argued that the acceptance of the episcopate should not involve either the denial or the affirmation of any theory of the ministry; and that such a concession of freedom of conviction within the one fellowship should not be regarded as a compromise.

As regards communion with other Churches (IV A, pp, 8, 9) any subsequent decisions of the united Church should be in agreement with the basis of union, and not an attempt by a majority to impose any fundamental change in this respect. While the changes proposed on page 11 the omission of the words ' an expectation,' and the substitution of ' temporary' for 'such,' are likely to arouse suspicion, as indicating a desire to force the pace in regard to the episcopally ordained ministry; yet I myself agree that, given the interval of thirty years for necessary adjustments, it is desirable that there should be the one type of ministry, provided that the status of no minister be injuriously affected. My hope is that, even before that time elapses, the missionaries will not be ordained by the Churches which send them, but by the Church they go to serve. I have often regretted that the rite of confirmation has not been preserved in all the

Churches of Christ; and thus can welcome the desire expressed for it, as also the concession that 'the Anglican rite need (not) be followed in detail.'

The desire that 'the authority of the episcopal body to publish pronouncements or instructions on matters of Faith and Order' should be referred to, I cannot share, unless careful provision be made to secure that their action shall always be representative and constitutional as organs of the whole body of believers. The Church in England at the present moment does not to an outsider present convincing evidence of the success of the exercise of episcopal authority.

While I have thus responded to the editor's invitation to offer my opinion, which I do with all becoming diffidence, I must make it clear that I have no authority to write in the name of Nonconformists generally, or even of Congregationalists, as I hold a distinctly individual opinion on these matters; in fact, I often feel myself to be 'the ugly duckling' of Hans Andersen's fable, a *rara avis* among Free Churchmen, because for me the agreements among Christians render their differences relatively insignificant, and no adequate justification for acquiescence in, and continuance of, our unhappy divisions.

Manifesto on Church Union

The following names have been added to the manifesto in No. 1 'Church Union'.

Rev. S. Daniel, S.P.G., Secunderabad.
Rev. Paul Isaac, S.P.G., Secunderabad.
V. Daniel Chellappa, B.A., B.L., District Munsiff, Secunderabad.
V. Enoch, Ellore.
K. Philip, Nuzvid.
K. J. G. Sundaram (Headmaster, Dornakal Training School, Dornakal).
A. J. Samuel, Pensioner, Military Works Services, Regimental Bazar, Secunderabad.
R. Williams, Y.M.C.A. Secretary, Secunderabad Division.
Rev. G. Prakasam.
Rev. Y. Devasirvatham, W. M. High School, Secunderabad.
Rev. G. Devamany, C.M.S. Deanery Chairman, Kanumole, Kistna District.
Rev. D. Devapryudu, C.M.S., Khammamett.
(Rev.) G. Thomas Prasadam, Priest, C.M.S., Raghavapuram, Kistna District.
(Rev.) P. P. Brahmanandan, Priest, C.M.S., Kodad, Khammamett District.
P. R. Stephens, C.T.S.'s Office, N.S.Rly., Secunderabad.
G. D. Samuel, Stores Clerk, N.S.Ry., Secunderabad.
Rev. S. S. Subbayya, Diocesan Missioner, Dornakal.
Rev. K. Adam, C.M.S., Mylavaram, Kistna District.
(Rev.) Z. David, C.M.S., Jaggayyapet, Kistna District.
Dr. J. S. William, L.M.P., Dornakal Jn.
Rev. Y. Pullayya, Kallur, Madira Taluq, C.M.S.
Rev. Puvvada John, C.M.S., Nadigudem.
Rev. Lambert O. R. Joseph, C.M.S., Vidyanagar.
J. Jacob, Hyderabad (Deccan).
John A. Masilamoni, Accountant, H.E.H., the Nizam's Service, Hyderabad.
R. C. Piper, Pensioner, Residency Office, Secunderabad.
Dr. Ratnam Pillay.
P. D. Paul, Hyderabad.
Rev. Y. Muthybhi, Masulipatam.
S. Manuel, Bible Depot, Secunderabad.
Rev. R. Immanuel, Chintalapudi, C.M.S.
(Rev.) D. Devadanam, C.M.S., Bantumalli (Kistna).
J. Bartholomew, B.A. B.Ed., Teacher, St. Paul's School, Ranchi.
J. K. Shah, B A., Teacher, St. Paul's School, Ranchi.
P. L. Ajiz, M.A. L T., Member Association Oriental Society, Late Member, Australian Methodist, Synod.
S. Chandra, Subdivisional Officer, Ranchi.
H. Chandra, Munsiff, S. S. O , Ranchi.
A. E. Shanker, M.D , Late S. P. G and C. M. S. Reg Proch Bro. Medical Missionary, Ranchi.
S. C. Roy, M.A., Principal, St. Paul's School, Ranchi.
A. C. Chatterji, Priest-in-charge of Klinke, Ranchi.
M Maite, Headmaster, S P.G.M.S. School, Baroda.
J. M. Laha, Incharge, Government Press, Ranchi.
J. C. Hayward, M.A., B.L., Pleader, Ranchi.
C. A. E. Karsallap, L.M.P.
N. K. Nimly, St. Barns Hospital, Ranchi.
D. P. Singh, Deputy Magistrate, Ranchi.
P. K. Shaw, Sub-Deputy Collector, Ranchi.
N. Vethanayagam, Evangelist, Mission Hospital, Conjeeveram.
V. Gnanadicam, Headmaster, C. S. M. High School, Conjeeveram.
G. Prakasam, Assistant, C. S. M. High School, Conjeeveram.
R. Jacob, L M P , In Medical Charge, Walajabad Hospital.
N. Vethanayagam, L.M.P., Medical Officer in charge, C. S. M. Hospital, Conjeeveram.

PRINTED AT THE C. L. S. PRESS, MADRAS—1930